

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/938,013	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeanine A Goldberg	1634	

All Participants:

(1) Jeanine A Goldberg.

(2) Dr. Khue Nguyen.

Date of Interview: 26 May 2004

Status of Application: _____

(3) Dr. Mai Nguyen.

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

The 103 obvious-type rejections

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Jong, Lefevre

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

J. Goldberg

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The nature of the invention was discussed to determine whether there were any elements of the specification which could be added to the claims and distinguish over the prior art. The applicant explained the invention and reiterated the quantitative nature of the invention. The examiner explained that the invention was novel (free of 102 rejections), however with regard to the question of obviousness (103 rejections), the examiner does not deem the invention to be non-obvious. The examiner acknowledges that applicants are prosecuting the application pro se and has tried to be of substantial assistance, however is unable to distinguish the teachings over the art. .